REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 13, 2005. Claims 1 to 11, 14 to 39, 42 to 67, 70 to 95 and 98 to 120 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Office Action noted that Applicants failed to disclose the co-pending application 09/895,021 (hereinafter, "the '021 application"). Applicants respectfully respond that the '021 application was not cited because it was not deemed relevant. A clear line of demarcation was maintained between the claims of the '021 application and those of the instant application, in that the claims of the '021 application are directed to device discovery, whereas the claims of the instant application are directed to print queue management. As a consequence, and since the applications are not prior art to each other, there is no need for a cross-citation between them. In this regard, Applicants are traversing the obviousness-type double patenting rejection, which was entered over Claims 1 to 184 of the '021 application, as detailed below.

In any event, in view of this comment from the Examiner, an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) accompanies this Amendment, to cite U.S. Patent No. 6,920,506, which issued on the '021 application.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for allegedly failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, specifically those including "user-configurable parameters." In addition, Claims 1 to 11, 14 to 39, 42 to 67, 70 to 95 and 98 to 112 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement because "user-configurable parameters" was allegedly new matter. The rejection is respectfully traversed, since the policy rules,

which are described in connection with one representation embodiment, are clearly disclosed as settable by a network administrator. Nevertheless, the claims have been amended to delete all references to "user-configurable parameters", so as to remove 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) and 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as issues. Withdrawal of the objection and rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

However, other changes have been made to the claims. For example, independent Claim 1 has been amended to reflect that the management method accesses policy rules for the print queue, and creates the print queue for a printing device based at least in part on the policy rules. Further, Claim 1 now reflects that the print queue is published to the network according to the policy rules. Dependent Claim 113 has been added to reflect that the policy rules include rules which regulate use of the print queue by client workstations connected to the network. Dependent Claim 114 has been added to reflect that the policy rules can be entered by a system administrator. Claim 14 has been amended to reflect that the print queue entry in the print queue configuration database is created according to the received information and the policy rules. Claim 15 has been amended to reflect that the received information includes an IP address, a MAC address, a print queue name, a server associated with the queue, and printing capabilities corresponding to the printing device associated with the queue.

Similar changes have been made to the other independent and dependent claims. These changes find clear support in the specification, for example, at page 24, lines 14 to 17, and page 8, line 3 to page 9, line 4.

Claims 1 to 11, 14 to 28, 57 to 67, 70 to 95 and 98 to 112 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural relationships of elements, specifically devices or elements performing the steps

or method as claimed. This rejection is respectfully traversed. All essential structural cooperative relationships of the rejected claims have been described. For example, in Claim 1, a printing device on the network is detected. Information is then requested from the detected device. The requested information is received from the printing device. Policy rules are accessed for a print queue. The print queue is then created for the printing device based on the received information and the policy rules. Finally, the print queue is published to the network according to the policy rules.

The Office Action states that these claims fail to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because they fail to recite the devices or element that perform the method steps as claimed. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no requirement that a particular device or element performing the method be described. In fact, any device that performs such method or steps would be an infringement. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 11, 14 to 39, 42 to 67, 70 to 95 and 98 to 112 were rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1 to 184 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 09/895,021 (now issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,920,506). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As mentioned above, the claims of the '021 application are directed to device discovery, whereas the claims of the instant application are directed to print queue management. As such, the claims of the instant application are patentably distinct from claims 1 to 184 of the '021 application, and an obviousness-type double patenting rejection is inappropriate. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 8, 10 to 11, 14, 19 to 23, 28 to 36, 38 to 39, 42, 47 to 51, 56 to 64, 66 to 67, 70, 75 to 79, 84 to 92, 94 to 95, 98, 103 to 107 and 112 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over European Patent No. 952513 (White) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,068 (Richter). Claims 9, 37, 65 and 93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over White-Richter as applied to Claims 1, 29, 57, and 85 and U.S. Patent No. 6,820,124 (Clough). Claims 14 to 18, 24 to 27, 42 to 46, 52 to 55, 70 to 74, 80 to 83, 98 to 102 and 108 to 111 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over White-Richter as applied to Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85 and U.S. Patent No. 6,628,413 (Lee). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns the management of printing queues on a network. It provides a queue management system in which queues can be created and published to a network according to information received from a printing device and queue policy rules. Among its many features, the present invention includes (i) the accessing of policy rules for a print queue and (ii) the creation of a print queue based at least in part on the policy rules.

In White and other conventional systems, basic print queues are created for the management of printing devices. However, these print queues only allow for the administrator or user to manage printing tasks within a print queue that already exists, and do not provide for the user or administrator to set policy rules for a print queue prior to its creation. Thus, for example, an administrator can not restrict access to the queue to certain workstations prior to its creation, such as those workstations that have a certain processing speed.

The present invention addresses these shortcomings by providing a method for managing printing devices on a network where policy rules for the print queue are accessed and a print queue is created based on the policy rules.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 1 as amended is directed to a method for managing a plurality of printing devices on a network. The method includes the step of detecting a printing device connected on the network. The method also includes a step of requesting information from the detected printing device. In addition, the method includes a step of receiving the requested information from the printing device. The method also includes a step of accessing policy rules for the print queue. The method further includes a step of creating a print queue for the printing device based on the received information and based on the policy rules. In addition, the method includes a step of publishing the print queue to the network according to the policy rules.

Independent Claim 29 as amended is directed to a network management device for managing a plurality of printing devices on a network. The network management device includes a program memory for storing process steps executable to perform a method. The method includes the step of detecting a printing device connected on the network. The method also includes a step of requesting information from the detected printing device. In addition, the method includes a step of receiving the requested information from the printing device. The method also includes a step of accessing policy rules for the print queue. The method further includes a step of creating a print queue for the printing device based on the received information and based on the policy rules. In addition, the method includes a step of publishing the print queue to the network according to the policy rules. Finally, the device includes a processor for executing these process steps stored in the program memory.

Independent Claim 57 as amended is directed to computer-executable process steps stored on a computer-readable medium. The computer-executable process steps are for managing a plurality of printing devices on a network, and are computer-executable process steps executable to perform a method. The method includes the step of detecting a printing device connected on the network. The method also includes a step of requesting information from the detected printing device. In addition, the method includes a step of receiving the requested information from the printing device. The method also includes a step of accessing policy rules for the print queue. The method further includes a step of creating a print queue for the printing device based on the received information and based on the policy rules. In addition, the method includes a step of publishing the print queue to the network according to the policy rules.

Independent Claim 85 as amended is directed to a computer-readable medium which stores computer-executable process steps. The computer-executable process steps to manage a plurality of printing devices on a network, and the computer-executable process steps comprise process steps executable to perform a method. The method includes the step of detecting a printing device connected on the network. The method also includes a step of requesting information from the detected printing device. In addition, the method includes a step of receiving the requested information from the printing device. The method also includes a step of accessing policy rules for the print queue. The method further includes a step of creating a print queue for the printing device based on the received information and based on the policy rules. In addition, the method includes a step of publishing the print queue to the network according to the policy rules.

The applied art, alone or in combination, is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of the present invention. In particular, the applied art is not seen to suggest or

disclose at least the features of (i) the accessing of policy rules for a print queue and (ii) the creation of a print queue based at least in part on the policy rules.

White is not understood to disclose or suggest the features of the current invention. As understood by Applicants, White discloses a system for automatic configuration of a printer. When a printer is connected to the network, White's system provides that the new printer is automatically seen on the network, and a driver for the printer is automatically configured. White's system creates a communication port and a print queue for the device.

Page 6 of the Office Action asserts that White (abstract, Fig.1, ¶3, ¶8) discloses creating a queue for the printing device based on the received information (from the printing device), and accessing user-configurable parameters for the print queue.

However, White is not seen to disclose or suggest a system that allows for policy rules to be accessed that can control how a print queue is created. In fact, in White the creation of the queue is seen to be quite basic:

> Additionally, a print queue is created 180 on print server 20 using a unique name based on the model name of printer 30 (supplied in the SLP reply packet). The print queue is then designated with network share access rights 180 so client processor 15 can use printer 30 over network 10.

Column 5, lines 10 to 15. Thus, White is not seen to disclose or suggest accessing any policy rules or creation of the queue according to those rules. At most, White is understood to assign a non-configurable default name to each queue. Further, the "user-configurable parameters" cited by the Office Action on page 6 are understood to be for the

configuration of the printers, and not of the queue. See column 1, lines 24 to 43. Therefore, White is not understood to disclose or suggest accessing policy rules for the queue or configuration of the queue at creation according to the policy rules.

In addition, Richter is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of the present invention. As understood by Applicants, Richter discloses a client print server link which allows a user at a client computer to access information and control print jobs from a single utility. Page 6 of the Office Action asserts that Richter (Figures 24 to 30, col. 13, line 25 *et seq.*) discloses publishing the print queue to the network and notifying the user of the print queues and their status.

However, like White, Richter is understood to be silent as to creation of a queue according to policy rules. In the portion cited by the Office Action, Richter is understood to provide for management of the printers and the print jobs therein, and not management of the queue. See Figures 24 to 30; column 13, line 25 to column 14, line 38. As understood by Applicants, Richter provides for status display of queues that already exist, and display and management of the print jobs therein on the "queue information screen", but is not seen to suggest the creation of print queues at all, much less creation of queues according to policy rules. See column 20, line 36 to column 21, line 33.

Furthermore, Lee is not seen to disclose or suggest the creation of a print queue according to policy rules. As understood by Applicants, Lee discloses a printer which utilizes the Java language and allows a user to control the printer via a World Wide Web interface.

Pages 8 and 9 of the Office Action assert that Lee (Fig. 3) discloses publishing rules and allowing a user or administrator to change rules for controlling printer tasks, such as maximum job size and to whom the print cost should be allocated.

As with White and Richter, however, Lee is seen to be silent on the creation of print queues according to policy rules. The Office Action states on page 9 that Lee provides for allowing a user or administrator to change rules for controlling tasks of the printer. The Office Action further notes that Lee "enables users to remotely configure printers' operation." Thus, the portions of Lee cited by the Office Action are understood to disclose management of printers, and not management of queues. See column 4, line 22 to column 5, line 55 and Figure 3. For example, Lee discloses that "any parameter usually set by buttons on a printer can be set through the standard WWW interface." Column 5, lines 11 to 12. Lee teaches a "queue manager", but again this is understood to provide only for management of printer jobs within an existing queue. See column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 21. Thus, Lee is not seen to suggest or disclose accessing policy rules for a print queue or creation of a queue based on the policy rules.

Finally, the Clough patent is understood to be addressed to the use of the SNMP protocol for communication, and is silent as to print queues.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, none of the applied references, either alone or in combination, are understood to disclose or suggest at least the features of accessing policy rules for the print queue and creating a print queue for a printing device based on the policy rules.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85 are believed to be allowable over the applied references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections of Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85 are therefore respectfully requested.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define

an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Finally, two formal matters are addressed. First, in view of the above traversal of the objections to the drawings, it is respectfully requested to receive an indication that the drawings filed on October 15, 2001, are approved.

Second, an IDS with fee was filed on September 20, 2005. Consideration of the art cited therein is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 103318v1